



As a former reporter and editor for the *Houston Chronicle* and *San Antonio Express-News*, as well as a former press relations manager for a major corporation, I applaud your July/August issue ("How the Media Press our Hot Buttons").

Over the years, I have watched the mainstream media degenerate into a gaggle of culturally illiterate, intellectually perverted, professionally corrupt left-wing propagandists thinly masquerading as journalists.

Marco Gilliam
San Antonio, Texas

Karina Rollins' "Doubt and Derision over Baghdad" (July/August) is biased against the actual truth of the war. Networks like NBC, CBS, FOX, and ABC are far from anything that could be considered liberal. They do little more than report the official White House line.

Ed Flynn
Montclair, New Jersey

Joel Kotkin ("Paths to Prosperity," July/August) inadvertently proves the point he's trying to refute. Kotkin takes issue with professor Richard Florida's claim that places with diverse populations and cultural life are likely to attract a "creative class" that develops high-value-added industries.

Kotkin argues that instead, higher growth is found in suburban areas with low housing costs that are attractive to families. But the examples he gives—places like California's Inland Empire and McAllen, Texas—are adding low-end jobs such as call centers, distribution, and manufacturing. Employers looking for the best talent know that an environment

that is hostile to gays will repel many potential employees of all sexual orientations, and are more likely to locate in areas that are diversity-friendly.

That's why the Los Angeles region's creative sectors, such as financial services and entertainment, are located in L.A. itself rather than the Inland Empire. Kotkin also misses the connections within regional economies. The Inland Empire is growing fast because it services L.A.'s cutting-edge sector. There's no inevitable divide between family-friendly regions and creative ones.

Jay Weiser
Baruch College
New York, New York

I was more than a little disappointed with Jonah Goldberg's review of my recent book, *What Liberal Media?* ("Big Dumb Lie," July/August).

Attacking me for allegedly using guilt-by-association tactics, Goldberg says in the very next paragraph that I am in the old tradition of the Left, going back to the 1930s when American communists attacked the motives of their accusers rather than the veracity of the accusation. Talk about guilt by association!

He also writes that "at times it seems Alterman has never even heard that the [New York] Times exists, let alone that it is both extremely liberal and more influential than any other news organ." A quick perusal of my book's index shows 44 mentions of the *Times*. Goldberg also misleads his readers when he says I simply dismiss "the proven fact that the vast majority of journalists admit they are liberal." In the

first place, it is no "proven fact." To even claim it is, is to misunderstand the meaning of the word "fact" since "liberal" is a descriptive adjective that is, to say the least, contested, and whose meaning is ever-changing. Virtually the entire second chapter of my book is devoted to examining where it's true and where it's false, and to taking apart the evidence for the claim.

His whopper of an ending is that "Somehow it doesn't occur to him, and the many other reporters in denial, that Fox News and Rush Limbaugh are giving Americans something they want very much and feel is missing from other media offerings." It occurs to me, um, that's why I wrote a book about it.

Eric Alterman
New York, New York

Jonah Goldberg replies: Alterman is offended by, but does not deny, the accusation of guilt-by-association tactics. Polls of journalists and news consumers alike show they tend to believe the media are liberal. I am fully aware that Alterman spends a great deal of time in his book discussing when it's fair to call the press liberal and when it isn't. My point is that his perspective is so left-wing it's not surprising that he can't see the liberal biases so obvious to average Americans. Perhaps he will credit the conclusion of liberal media critic Tim Noah of the liberal *Slate* writing in the liberal *Washington Monthly*: "The New York Times and [NPR] are still identifiably liberal, though Alterman won't acknowledge it, possibly because Alterman's own political outlook is a little to their left. His book's most irritating omission is its failure to discuss these two news outlets at length."

